

More on “Atomic jumps in quasiperiodic $\text{Al}_{72.6}\text{Ni}_{10.5}\text{Co}_{16.9}$ and related crystalline material”

Gerrit Coddens

Laboratoire des Solides Irradiés, Ecole Polytechnique, F-91128-Palaiseau CEDEX, France
(today)

We strongly disagree with a number of statements by Dolinšek et al. about phason dynamics in quasicrystals (QCs).

We are shocked by the methods used in the Reply of Dolinšek and Dubois [1] to a Comment [2] of ours to their paper, [3] which unduly thwart our attempts of clarification.

(1) We would like to draw the attention of the reader to a whole series of repeated attempts to put two completely disparate phenomena under a common denominator (1a-c). They serve as a platform to qualify phason dynamics as not special.

(1a) Phason dynamics and regular atomic jumps in a B2-based phase would be the same physics since they are both leading to a broad (fast) quasielastic neutron scattering signal. [4]

(1b) Phason dynamics and regular atomic jumps in a B2-based phase would be the same physics since phason sites in QCs and structural vacancies in B2-based phases would be both “structural vacancies” according to an awkward new definition, introduced *ad hoc* by the authors. [1]

(1c) Phason dynamics and regular atomic jumps in a B2-based phase would be the same physics since both QCs and B2-based phases would be “open structures”. [1] In reality, there is no proof for the claim that a QC would be an “open structure”. [5] The authors “derive” it *inductively* from the wrong premises (1a)-(1b). But the fact that a number of sites are offered to an atom to jump to, does not forcedly imply that the structure is “open”, as the counterexample of interstitial sites clearly shows. (Furthermore, the fact that phason jumps in quasicrystals are assisted means that there is more to it than just the presence of a site available. Certain atoms might have to move temporarily out of the way to render the jump possible).

What characterizes if something is special, are the features that it has *not* in common with other things. Drawing a long list of indistinctive features shared with other things is not a valid procedure to prove that something is not special. Such an argument is based on an invalid inversion and/or negation of the logical implication. [6]

The introduction of claim (1c) is a remarkable construction, that is based on the same leitmotiv of incorrect inversion and/or negation of the logical implication. It is easily recognized that claims (1a-b) are harsh and wrong. With claim (1c) the authors take us upwards an *ad hoc* deductive (implication) scheme, towards a less outspoken situation. It is much more difficult to discuss the claim (1c) and to prove conclusively that it is wrong on the ba-

sis of presently available data than claims (1a-b). [7] The difficulty to come to terms with claim (1c) must permit doubts to linger on about the issues (1a)-(1b), by suggesting that they would follow rather logically from (1c), and that (1c) is plausible. In reality, as we mentioned, (1c) has been artificially postulated to yield (1a)-(1b): It is thus (1c) that has been “derived” from (1a)-(1b) rather than (1a)-(1b) from (1c). But we are not obliged to discuss the truth of postulate (1c), as it is totally obvious that (1a)-(1b) are wrong, independently of the issue if postulate (1c) is wrong or otherwise. It is also totally obvious that phason dynamics in a QC and regular atomic jumps in a B2-based phase are not the same physics, even if the signals they give rise to may look similar in certain selected aspects.

(2) In the repeated attempts to identify phason dynamics with conventional atomic hopping in a B2-based phase, each time contradicting evidence has been ignored.

(2a) Making use of SrTiO_3 to depict phason jumps in QC as nothing special is not appropriate because the corresponding high-temperature oxygen dynamics in SrTiO_3 are not ultrafast as in QCs.

(2b) Similarly, in the B2-based phase, the jumps are indeed fast like in QCs, but here it is the geometry, temperature dependence, etc... that do not blend into the picture. The jump distances are not short as in QCs and instead the fast dynamics are a trivial consequence of a huge vacancy concentration, which has no counterpart in QCs.

In both cases it is tacitly denied that there is more to phason dynamics than just the one single aspect that is being picked. Phason dynamics are fast, there is a special geometry involved in the phason site that is an intrinsic part of the definition of the quasilattice itself, phasons have an unusual, special temperature dependence, there could exist correlated simultaneous jumps of several atoms, etc...

(3) The authors present the reader with a long, technical demonstration that the signal in AlCuNi is not magnetic. The motivation for this should be that I would have claimed that the NMR signal in AlNiCo is due to magnetism. The reader can verify in the text of my Comment that I never stated that the signal in AlNiCo is magnetic. I addressed AlPdMn which is well known to be magnetic for certain compositions, a fact the authors admit themselves. I clearly stated that I wanted to

mention magnetism as a possibility *in principle*, in order to show that the interpretation of NMR data is not as straightforward as the authors try to make us believe (by not providing any discussion at all), and that the authors have already been misguided by their lack of rigor in the past, presenting a magnetic signal as evidence for phason dynamics.

(4) The purpose of my Comment was to indicate that the interpretation of the authors is wrong and that the authors have not bothered about eliminating alternative, more reasonable interpretations of their data. If my preference goes to an interpretation of their data in the form of some small non-phasonic atomic displacements, due to the presence of lattice distortions induced by structural defects, I pointed out that this does not mean that I claim any interpretation at all. The burden of the (perhaps presently inaccessible) correct interpretation and its proof remains entirely with the authors, and one cannot reverse this situation by picking one example in my objection that there are many other possible interpretations *in principle*, in order to mispresent my Comment as a wrong interpretation of the data. That the authors go into great efforts to explain that the signal in AlNiCo is not magnetic is perhaps fine, but not really needed. It distracts the attention of the reader from the essence of the discussion and it is already well established that AlNiCo is not magnetic.

(5) As the authors now admit, the attribution of the NMR signal in reference [8] was wrong. At the time I pointed out in a Comment [9] that the temperature behavior of their signal could not possibly agree with their interpretation in terms of phason dynamics. The Reply [10] thwarted the recognition of the fact that that conclusion was final. The authors postponed admitting that the signal was due to magnetism to another occasion. [11] Nonetheless, in reference [3] the authors claimed again that the signal observed in reference [8,12] is a valid observation of phason dynamics and the Kalugin-Katz transition. And in the present reply they admit once again that this is wrong and that the AlPdMn data have been overinterpreted.

(6) We would like to draw the reader's attention to the use the authors make of a paper by Yan et al. [13] who erroneously called phason sites vacancies. This was pointed out in a Comment [14] but clarification was thwarted by a statement in the Reply by Yan et al. [15] that they used a different definition of the compound word "columnar vacancy", in order to escape from the criticism that they introduced a different definition of the single word "vacancy". This non-conventional definition had not been given in the original paper and was just introduced *a posteriori* in the Reply. Such *ad hoc* methods are not viable and can only produce confusion. Dolinsek and Dubois built on that confusion twice: (a) They claimed that AlNiCo contains a lot of "vacant sites" citing the paper by Yan et al., ignoring my Comment on it. (b) Now I have pointed out once again that phason sites are not vacancies, they take the same loophole of escape as Yan et al.

and state that they use a different definition for the compound word "structural vacancy". Again, the use of a different definition is explicated *a posteriori*, and at variance with normal, legitimate expectations. The scientific convenience of such a definition has been discussed under (1).

(7) The authors say that they have been cautious by stating that the data are *compatible* with phason dynamics. This is perhaps not a direct claim, but nevertheless far too much of a claim. The caution does not serve to warn the reader but to thwart due criticism for trying to pass an unwarranted claim. Real caution would consist in stating that the data are also compatible with a plethora of (more reasonable) explanations. And there are enough other arguments in my Comment that show that the data do *not* correspond to phason dynamics.

(8) When I stated it is not proved that tunneling states are not phasons, I thought that perhaps, it might never be possible to prove that they are not phasons, due to the limitations of the techniques. This certainly does not imply that it would be reasonable to claim that tunneling states are phasons: There is more in being right than not being proved wrong. In fact, the authors do not mention that there is even less proof that tunneling states would be phasons. No argument is given to substantiate their claim, except the experimental difficulties one encounters to provide the absolute final proof of the contrary. The reader will certainly be surprised to learn that in reference [16] the authors state themselves that "tunneling are definitely not an intrinsic property of quasicrystals", contradicting their own claims!

Let us add to that that the double wells in phason dynamics are defined on Euclidean three-dimensional space, while those in tunneling states are defined on an abstract configuration space. The *new* interpretation proposed by Dolinsek and Dubois rests thus on a confusion between two very different realities covered by the same words "double well". We pointed out that phason dynamics in QCs explore a discrete set of jump vectors, in contrast to what is considered to happen in tunneling states. That was already an excellent indication that tunneling states are not phasons.

(9) That it is not possible to link the high-temperature neutron signals to their NMR data, cannot justify the high-profile claims of the authors. They try to save their interpretation of the NMR signals in an amended version by claiming that there could be a cross-over of dynamical regime from hopping to tunneling. The surprising character of this claim should not disarm or confuse the reader: It cannot make away with our arguments based on the X-ray data. We pointed out that in AlNiCu there is clear evidence from X-ray diffraction for an order-disorder transition. Below the transition temperature, the jump dynamics are just frozen. X-ray diffraction would not give evidence for an order-disorder transition if the atomic motion just crossed over from over-the-barrier hopping to tunneling, because it would still detect the instantaneous positional disorder, created by

the atomic motion.

Furthermore, it must be clear that the distances in Al-NiCu are too large (and the transition temperature too high) to consider tunneling of the type proposed by the authors as a real possibility. A comparison with tunneling in SrTiO₃ is thus totally inappropriate.

On the same footing, it is generally admitted that the freezing of phason hopping in QCs is responsible for the increase of diffuse scattering observed below a certain temperature (which is e.g. ≈ 600 C in AlPdMn). If there were a cross-over from phason hopping to phason tunneling, there would be no change in the X-ray data below the cross-over temperature.

(10) I already pointed out that in AlPdMn the assistance energies are not close to 0.6 eV. Until much more serious proof is given caution requires thus to consider the numerical similarities as coincidences.

(11) The authors deny me the use of the word "phason", although I come first in matters of having spelled out numerous times the limitations of this terminology. [17,18] Moreover, the latter criticism could be extended to the whole literature on QCs - often on much more serious grounds [19] - rather than just focusing it onto the subject of my work on phason dynamics, the significance of which extends far beyond a mere matter of terminology.

(12) The farfetched, invalid criticisms of this group on my work [20] make a long, damaging, disparate list. The motivations given for the present attacks contradict each other. The authors state to have selected *on purpose* a sample with an exceptional amount of structural vacancies to permit them to qualify phason dynamics as "not special" [4] or "not QC-specific". But previously they have stated to be "surprized" as they "did *not intend* to question the excellent work on phason dynamics". [21] It is thus just that all this excellent work has been witlessly misaimed at forcing an open door. The tacit implications of this declaration of intention of the authors carry strong personal undertones. The same can be said about the gratuitous, subjective rating that phason dynamics are not special. But both issues can even not be touched upon without attracting further personal discredit.

analogy. The platypus is a unique animal in that is both a mammal and laying eggs. The argument of the authors is analogous to claiming that there is nothing special about the platypus as birds are laying eggs as well.

- [7] This is due to the lack of adequate experimental procedures: QC single-domain samples contain large holes that thwart a reliable determination of their density.
- [8] J. Dolinšek, T. Apih, M. Simsič and J.M. Dubois, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 572 (1999).
- [9] G. Coddens, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83** 884, (1999).
- [10] J. Dolinšek, T. Apih, M. Simsič and J.M. Dubois, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83** 885, (1999).
- [11] J.L. Gavilano, S. Mushkolaj, H.R. Ott, T. Apih, J. Dolinšek, J.M. Dubois, and K. Urban, Physica B **284**, 1167 (2000).
- [12] J.M. Dubois, J. Phys.: Cond. Matter **13**, 7753 (2001).
- [13] Y. Yan, S.J. Pennycook and A.P. Tsai, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 5145 (1998).
- [14] G. Coddens, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82** (1999) 4366.
- [15] Y. Yan, S.J. Pennycook and A.P. Tsai, **82** (1999) 4367.
- [16] A. Bilušić, A. Smon-tara, J. Dolinšek, H.R. Ott, I.R. Fisher and P.C. Canfield, arXiv:cond-mat/0307458v1 (18.07.2003).
- [17] G. Coddens, R. Bellissent, Y. Calvayrac and J.P. Ambroise, Europhys. Lett. **16**, 271 (1991).
- [18] G. Coddens, S. Lyonnard, B. Hennion, and Y. Calvayrac, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 6268 (2000).
- [19] M. de Boissieu, M. Boudard, B. Hennion, R. Bellissent, S. Kycia, A. Goldman, C. Janot and M. Audier, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 89 (1995).
- [20] See e.g. citations 65-69 in reference [18]. It has also been claimed that the quasielastic signal observed in AlCuFe is an artifact due to selective segregation of Cu atoms into the grain boundaries (C. Janot, letter to PRL editorial board, Fall 1993), and that the first unambiguous experimental evidence for phason hopping was obtained by Janot and published in ILL reports (C. Janot, letter with carbon copy to director of ILL, 6th April 1995).
- [21] U. Dahlborg, W.S. Howells, M. Calvo-Dahlborg, J. Dolinšek and J.M. Dubois, J. Phys.: Cond. Matter **13**, 8873 (2001).

-
- [1] J. Dolinšek and J.M. Dubois, Phys. Rev. B, in press.
 - [2] G. Coddens, Phys. Rev. B, in press.
 - [3] J. Dolinšek, T. Apih, P. Jeglič, M. Feuerbacher, M. Calvo-Dahlborg, U. Dahlborg and J.M. Dubois, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 212203 (2002).
 - [4] U. Dahlborg, W.S. Howells, M. Calvo-Dahlborg, and J.M. Dubois, J. Phys.: Cond. Matter **12**, 4021 (2000).
 - [5] The terminology "open structure" is vague and not clearly defined.
 - [6] We can illustrate the relevance of these methods by an